



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,868	02/23/2004	Enrique Travieso	074869-0015	9488
20277 7590 10/02/2008 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				
EXAMINER				
AL HASHEMI, SANA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2169				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/784,868

**Applicant(s)**

TRAVIESO ET AL.

**Examiner**

Sana Al-Hashemi

**Art Unit**

2169

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 57-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 57-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is issued in response to applicant amendment/RCE filed 8/14/08.

Claims 1-56 were canceled. Claims 57-93 were amended. No claims were added.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/14/08 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 57- 61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84, and 87-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz US Patent No. 7,207,005 filed Dec. 5, 2002 which is a

continuation of US Patent No. 6,526,426 filed Jan 28, 1999 in view of Kraft US Patent Application Publication filed Dec. 28, 2002.

Regarding Claims 57, 72, and 88, Lakritz, discloses a machine implemented method for synchronizing content in different languages, comprising the steps of:

accessing content in a first language (Col. 15, lines 9-11, Lakritz), including content retrieved by following a link contained in web content (Fig. 12, steps 1210-1215, Lakritz); Lakritz is silent with respect to the newly amended limitations "retrieved by crawling a web site". It has been admitted by the applicant the crawling is a well-known and commonly understood by a person ordinary skilled in the art and to expedite the prosecution of the application the examiner presents a secondary teach "Kraft" which discloses the crawling method as shown in paragraph 14. it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the crawling search. skilled artisan would have been motivated to make such modification to the Lakritz system to improve the search since the crawling is an automated program that searches the Internet for new web documents and indexes their addresses and content -related information in a database, which can be content examined for matches by search engine. Furthermore the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses the rest of the limitations as stated below

dividing the content into one or more translatable components (Col. 4, lines 61-65, Lakritz);

determining whether there exists at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component (Col. 5, lines 48-57, Lakritz); and

designating, when at least one translatable component does not have a corresponding translated component, at least a portion of the content for translation from the first language to a second language Col. 5, lines 58-67, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 58, 73, and 89, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method further comprising the step of generating an identifier for each of the translatable components, wherein the identifier is used in the step of determining each of the at least one translatable component (Col. 6, lines 6-14, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 59, 74, and 90, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method further comprising the step of adding the at least one translatable component and associated identifier to a translation list for translation into the second language (Col. 6, lines 14-18, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 60, 75, and 91, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein the translation from the first language to the second language is by at least one of human translation and machine translation (Col. 11, lines 3-4, Lakritz).

Regarding Claim 61, 76, and 93, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein each of the translatable components is at least one of:

a text segment;

an image file (Col. 20, lines 56-59, Lakritz);

an audio clip;

a video clip; and

a file.

Regarding claims 62, and 77, a method wherein an identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments (art will not be applied since the limitation in this claim is further limiting the text segment which was not addressed in claim 61).

Regarding Claim 63, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein the step of determining is performed with respect to previously translated components in the second language that are stored in association with their corresponding identifiers (Col. 20, lines 44-50, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 64, and 79, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein:

the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (Col. 20, lines 38-40, Lakritz);

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (Col. 20, 40-43, Lakritz); and

the second language is different from the first language (Col. 18, lines 42-58, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 65, and 80, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein the designating comprises the step of adding a Universal Resource Locator (URL) associated with the at least a portion of the content to a translation list for translation (Col. 22, lines 13-19, Lakritz).

Regarding claims 67, and 81, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein the designating comprises the step of adding the at least a portion of the content to a translation list for translation (Col. 29, lines 9-17, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 70, and 86, a method further comprising:

computing at least one of a hash code and a checksum for a file that is one of the first content containing markup tags and a file linked from the first content containing markup tags;  
and

determining that the at least one of the hash code and the checksum does not equal a previously computed at least one hash code and checksum that was computed for a previously processed file;

wherein the dividing, determining whether there exists a translatable component does not have a corresponding translated component, and designating are performed in response to the determining that the at least one of the hash code and the checksum does not equal a previously computed at least one hash code and checksum that was computed for a previously processed file (art will not be applied since the limitation in this claim is further limiting the file which was not addressed in claim 61).

Regarding Claim 71, and 87, the combination of Lakritz in view of Kraft discloses a method wherein the dividing is based upon markup tags contained in the content in the first language (Col. 15, 16, lines 65-67, and 1-3 respectively, Lakritz).

Regarding Claim 92, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the information-processing portion is configured for retrieving the content in the first language from a web site (Col. 36, lines 61-67, Lakritz).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 57-93 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues the Lakritz failed to disclose the newly amended limitation.

Examiner disagrees. The newly amended limitation has been addressed in the rejection above.

Applicant argues the previous office action fail to address claims 62, 67-70, 77, and 85-86.

Examiner disagrees. Claim 62, 67-70, 77, and 85-86, Claiming one of the translated component claimed in claim 61, and since claim 61 calls for at least one of a text segment, an image file, an audio clip, a video clip, and a file, and since art was applied to file image the rest of the list was not addressed and claims 62, 67-70, 77, and 85-86 further limiting the non addressed component therefore art was not applied to any of the claims as stated in the rejection above.

***Point of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is 571-272-4013. The examiner can normally be reached on 8Am-4:30Pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pierre Vital can be reached on 571-272-4125. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sana Al-Hashemi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164